

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

JUL 11 2007

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1 - 16 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103 Over Castello in view of Pierce

Claims 1-3, 8 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello (US 4,931,051) in view of Pierce et al. (WO 00/76438). The Office Action asserted that Castello teaches a diaper having a backsheet (190), a topsheet (170) and an absorbent core (180). The Office Action further asserted that Castello teaches a color wetness indicator printed onto a surface of a backsheet of the diaper (col 2, lines 30-62) and a coating or varnish over the wetness indicator to prevent premature activation (col. 5, lines 14-21). The Office Action noted that Castello fails to teach that the color wetness indicator is hydrolyzable. The Office Action relied on Pierce as disclosing an absorbent article having wetness indicating graphics that dissolve in response to urine or water such that the graphic becomes visible.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three requirements must be met. MPEP §2143. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited references or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinarily skilled in the art, to modify the reference. *Id.* Second, there must be some reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Third, the cited references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *Id.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Castello discloses a wetness indicator used on absorbent pads such as diapers for signaling the presence of water. Castello teaches that the active component of the wetness indicator is a hydratable salt which undergoes a color change when it transforms from an anhydrous compound to a hydrated compound. (See column 3, lines 37-40). According to the specification, the color change is the result of hydration, i.e. the chemical process of combining with water, where water maintains itself. (See column 4,

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

lines 22-31). In contrast, independent claim 1 recites a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition. That is, the color composition of claim 1 changes color as the result of hydrolysis, i.e. the chemical process of splitting water into proton and hydroxide. As a result, the color composition undergoes a chemical reaction so that the graphic becomes visible to the unaided eye, i.e. the graphic appears. This is an important difference because hydration is usually reversible, while hydrolysis is not reversible.

Moreover, the deficiencies of Castello are not resolved by Pierce. Pierce is directed to a disposable absorbent article that includes active graphics that can change color during use and can provide an interactive training aid. In particular, the reference relates to an absorbent article comprising: an outer cover having an interior surface, an opposite exterior surface and a first color; an absorbent assembly disposed on the interior surface; and an active graphic disposed on the outer cover and comprising a color change composition, the active graphic having a pre-activation color different from the first color and a post-activation color substantially the same as the first color. Irrespective of these teachings, however, the reference fails to teach or suggest a graphic, like Applicant's color composition, that changes from invisible to visible as the result of hydrolysis. Rather, Pierce teaches one or more active graphics that when contacted with fluid appear or fade to match the color of the outer cover. There is no mention or teaching by Pierce of an ink composition that undergoes hydrolysis in order to form a graphic that "appears" upon wetting.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Because the cited combination fails to teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed article in the possession of the public. Since claims 2-3, 8 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, the cited combination also fails to teach all of their claim limitations. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants assert that claims 1-3, 8 and 12 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Schleinz et al (US 5458590) and Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Ito et al (US 5595754). The deficiencies of the Castello and Pierce references are not resolved by Schleinz et al. While Schleinz et al teaches an ink blend comprising n-propyl acetate, Applicant finds no teaching by Schleinz et al of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 and containing a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition. Moreover, the deficiencies of the Castello and Pierce reference are not resolved by Ito et al. While Ito et al teaches absorbent color-changing sheets which use polyamides as resins in an impermeable layer, Applicant finds no teaching by Ito et al of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 and containing a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition.

Since claims 4-6 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, the cited combination also fails to teach all of their claim limitations. *In re Fine*, supra. Therefore, Applicants assert that claims 4-6 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Castello and Pierce

and further in view of Olson

Claims 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Olson et al (WO 00/76442).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the three requirements discussed above must be met. See MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As discussed previously, the Castello reference teaches a wetness indicator comprising a salt that undergoes a color change upon hydration as opposed to the hydrolyzable color composition as recited in claims 1 and 11. Pierce teaches one or more active graphics that when contacted with fluid appear or fade to match the color of the

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

JUL 11 2007

outer cover. However, Applicant finds no teaching by Castello or Pierce of an ink composition that undergoes hydrolysis in order to form a graphic that "appears" upon wetting as required by claims 1 and 11.

While Olson et al teaches an absorbent article having a changing wetness indicator printed on an inner surface of a backsheet, Applicant finds no teaching by Olson et al of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 or the method of printing defined by claim 11, and containing a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, supra. Because the cited combination fails to teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 11, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed disposable absorbent article or method of printing in the possession of the public. Since claim 7 depends from claim 1, the cited references also fail to teach all of its claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 7 and 11 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Castello and Pierce in view of Polansky et al

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Polansky et al. (US 4,249,532).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the three requirements discussed above must be met. See MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As discussed previously, the Castello reference teaches a wetness indicator comprising a salt that undergoes a color change upon hydration as opposed to the hydrolyzable color composition as recited in claim 1. Pierce teaches one or more active graphics that when contacted with fluid appear or fade to match the color of the outer

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

cover. However, Applicant finds no teaching by Castello or Pierce of an ink composition that undergoes hydrolysis in order to form a graphic that "appears" upon wetting as required by claim 1.

The deficiencies of the Castello and Pierce references are not resolved by Polansky et al. In the Office Actions dated May 26, 2006, October 31, 2006 and April 19, 2007, the Office stated that: "Polansky teaches a seal coat underlying a graphic design." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's characterization of the placement of the seal coat as taught by Polansky et al. Specifically, Polansky et al discloses that design 16 is imprinted on an inner side 17 of a polyethylene sheet 13 so as to be visible for the outer side 18. (See column 1, lines 58-61). Further, Polansky et al teaches that after imprinting design 16 a seal coat 24 covers the printed colors. (See column 2, lines 8-10) Thus, the sealing coat of Polansky is disposed over the design rather than underneath, i.e. sheet 13, design 16 and sealing coat 24 disposed over design 16. In contrast, claim 10 recites a varnish coating disposed beneath the color composition so that the varnish coating is between the substrate and the color composition.

Notwithstanding, Applicant finds no teaching by Polansky et al of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 and containing a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, supra. Because the cited combination fails to teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed disposable absorbent article in the possession of the public. Since claims 9 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, the cited references also fail to teach all of their claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 9 and 10 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Amdt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Castello and Pierce
and further in view of Perrault

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Perrault et al (US 4717378).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the three requirements discussed above must be met. See MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As discussed previously, the Castello reference teaches a wetness indicator comprising a salt that undergoes a color change upon hydration as opposed to the hydrolyzable color composition as recited in claims 1 and 11. Pierce teaches one or more active graphics that when contacted with fluid appear or fade to match the color of the outer cover. However, Applicant finds no teaching by Castello or Pierce of an ink composition that undergoes hydrolysis in order to form a graphic that "appears" upon wetting as required by claim 1.

While Perrault teaches a method for detecting dehydration of a hydrogel which includes using D&C Red #27, Applicant finds no teaching by Perrault of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 and containing a wetness indicator comprising a hydrolyzable color composition.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, supra. Because the cited combination fails to teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed disposable absorbent article in the possession of the public. Since claim 13 depends indirectly from claim 1, the cited references also fail to teach all of its claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 13 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Arndt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Castello and Pierce in view of Howell

Claims 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castello and Pierce as applied to claims 1-3, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Howell et al (US 5,389,093).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the three requirements discussed above must be met. See MPEP §2143. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As discussed previously, the Castello reference teaches a wetness indicator comprising a salt that undergoes a color change upon hydration as opposed to the hydrolyzable color composition as recited in claim 14. Pierce teaches one or more active graphics that when contacted with fluid appear or fade to match the color of the outer cover. However, Applicant finds no teaching by Castello or Pierce of an ink composition that undergoes hydrolysis to form a carboxylic acid upon wetting as required by claims 14-16.

While Howell teaches a thermochromatic ink comprising a fatty acid that changes color in response to a change in temperature triggered by the presence of urine, Applicant finds no teaching by Howell of a disposable absorbent article as defined by claim 1 and 14 containing a wetness indicator comprising a color composition that changes from invisible to visible as the result of hydrolysis.

References relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *In re Payne*, supra. Because the cited combination fails to teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 14, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has not placed the presently claimed disposable absorbent article in the possession of the public. Since claim 15 depends from claim 14 and claim 16 depends from claim 1, the cited references also fail to teach all of their claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 14-16 are nonobvious over the cited combination and are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/827,088
Docket No. 9606
Am dt. dated July 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 11 2007


Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 USC §103(a). Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1 - 16 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 
John P. Colbert
Registration No. 45,765
(513) 634-0037

Date: July 11, 2007
Customer No. 27752
(Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)
Revised 04/25/2006